

GS.II Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of findings from information and data collected from all available sources, including monitoring, complaint investigations and hearing resolutions.

1. Baseline/Trend Data and Analysis (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

Districts complete a Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) the year prior to their monitoring review. Self-assessment results are compared to results of file reviews conducted by monitoring staff. Comparisons show a high level of agreement. The desk reviews that are conducted by monitoring staff include looking at the district SEMSAs as well as any child complaint or hearing decision information for that district. Selections of districts that will receive an on-site visit are based on all of this information.

The following table comparatively summarizes monitoring and child complaint issues for school year 2002-2003.

COMPARISON OF MONITORING AND CHILD COMPLAINT FINDINGS:

AREA	MONITORING		CHILD COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS		
Evaluation	Children with disabilities receive timely evaluations, including children transitioning from Part C, if applicable.	43.46% noncompliant	Evaluations/Reevaluations (General)	9/19 allegations out of compliance =	47.37% noncompliant
	Evaluations are appropriately administered, including evaluations for children transitioning from Part C, if applicable.	64.25% noncompliant	Conduct of the Evaluation	13/42 allegations out of compliance =	30.95% noncompliant
	Parents are afforded the opportunity to provide information that is used in the evaluations.	29.47% noncompliant	Timelines	15/34 allegations out of compliance =	44.12% noncompliant
	Eligibility criteria are applied appropriately for all initial evaluation.	22.22% noncompliant	All evaluation complaints	38/105 allegations out of compliance =	36.19% noncompliant
	Parents and children with disabilities are involved, when appropriate, in the evaluation and eligibility determination process.	51.32% noncompliant			
Transfer Procedures	The public agency implements required procedures for students who transfer from another state or from another Missouri district.	28.49% noncompliant	Transfer Procedures	8/16 allegations out of compliance =	50.00% noncompliant
Procedural Safeguards	Prior Written Notice is provided to parents and children, when appropriate, as required by state and federal regulations.	54.45% noncompliant	Provision of Notice	15/80 allegations out of compliance =	18.75% noncompliant

AREA	MONITORING		CHILD COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS		
Secondary Transition	Children with disabilities, beginning at age 14, have IEPs that focus on a course of study related to transition objectives.	31.38% noncompliant	Post-Secondary Transition	2/6 allegations out of compliance =	33.33% noncompliant
	Children with disabilities, beginning at age 16, have IEPs that coordinate instruction (including related services), community and employment experiences, adult living objectives, and linkages with other service providers or agencies as determined appropriate to meet the post secondary goals of the student.	22.84% non compliant			
Special Education and Related Services (continued on next page)	Special Education and related services are provided as specified by the child's IEP.	22.00% noncompliant	Failure to provide services	19/75 allegations out of compliance =	25.33% noncompliant
	Children with disabilities are provided supplementary aids and services, accommodations and modifications to support success in regular education settings.	34.95% noncompliant	IEP Implementation	56/153 allegations out of compliance =	36.60% noncompliant
	The IEP provides for involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.	54.12% noncompliant	Special Education and Related Services (general)	4/25 allegations out of compliance =	16.00% noncompliant
	Special factors (e.g., behavior, limited English proficiency, Braille, communication needs, and assistive technology services/devices) are taken into consideration when developing the IEP.	21.83% noncompliant	Failure to address	2/9 allegations out of compliance =	22.22% noncompliant
			Assistive Technology	4/7 allegations out of compliance =	57.14% noncompliant
			Progress Reports	8/23 allegations out of compliance =	34.80% noncompliant
			Provision of copy of IEP	8/19 out of compliance =	42.11% noncompliant

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04.

Comparisons of monitoring and child complaint data suggest monitoring of districts scheduled for review are helping to identify if particular systemic issues exist. Data show that areas found out of compliance in monitoring reviews are also the basis for child complaints. Three particular monitoring items exhibit higher percents of noncompliance as compared to percents of child complaint allegations, i.e. appropriate administration of evaluations (Evaluation), the provision of prior written notice (Procedural Safeguards), and IEP providing for involvement in the general curriculum (Special Education and Related Services). All were about 30% higher suggesting monitoring of these items may be helping to redress the need for child complaint allegations.

Monitoring Data:

General Administration 5 -- The public agency conducts a program evaluation as required

	Total Districts/ Agencies Reviewed	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Incomplete Follow-up 1 reviews for this standard	# out of compliance on completed Follow-up 1	# incomplete Follow-up 2	# out of compliance on Follow-up 2	% initial reviews out of compliance
2001-2002	92	5	0	1	1		5.4%
2002-2003	90	8	7	1	1		8.9%

Source: Missouri Division of Special Education - Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) as of 03/30/04.

Note: Monitoring data based on Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) submitted by district.

Formulas: Percent of districts reviewed out of compliance = Number of districts out of compliance at initial review/Total districts reviewed

These data, based on each district's Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA), show that the majority of districts are completing the Annual Program Evaluation as required in the Missouri State Plan for Special Education.

2. Targets (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

- Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of data from all available sources.

3. Explanation of Progress or Slippage (for reporting period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003):

The development and implementation of the Compliance Monitoring System to collect and maintain data in school year 2001-2002 provided integral monitoring information which can then be compared to child complaint data. The SEMSA and monitoring processes use all available data from monitoring, child complaints, due process hearings and anecdotal information.

4. Projected Targets:

- Systemic issues are identified and remediated through the analysis of data from all available sources.
- Additional targets are included in the Future Activities table

5 & 6. Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets/Results and Projected Timelines and Resources:

See also GS.I, GS.V, BF.VI and BT

IP Key	Improvement Strategies (5)	Future Activities to Achieve Projected Targets(5)	Evidence of Change (4)	Projected Timelines & Resources (6)
1.1.4 GS.II	D) FY04 monitoring results analyzed to determine level of understanding and compliance with IDEA requirements for locating and providing services to youth with disabilities held in city/county jails.	1.1.4.1 Revised procedures implemented 1.1.4.2 Data entered into system 1.1.4.3 Reports generated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data obtained on extent of understanding and compliance with IDEA requirements for locating and providing services to youth with disabilities incarcerated in city/county jails. 	Timelines: July 2005 Resources: <u>Section Responsibility:</u> Compliance Monitoring system reports <u>Funding Type:</u> Part B